

In-medium pion weak decay constants

Hungchong Kim*

Institute of Physics and Applied Physics,

Yonsei University, Seoul 120-749, Korea

Abstract

In nuclear matter, the pion weak decay constant is separated into the two components f_t, f_s corresponding to the time and space components of the axial-vector current. Using QCD sum rules, we compute the two decay constants from the pseudoscalar-axial vector correlation function in the matter $i \int d^4x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle \rho | T[\bar{d}(x) i \gamma_5 u(x) \bar{u}(0) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 d(0)] | \rho \rangle$. It is found that the sum rule for f_t satisfies the in-medium Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner (GOR) relation precisely while the f_s sum rule does not. The f_s sum rule contains the non-negligible contribution from the dimension 5 condensate $\langle \bar{q} i D_0 i D_0 q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q} g_s \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_N$ in addition to the in-medium quark condensate. Using standard set of QCD parameters and ignoring the in-medium change of the pion mass, we obtain $f_t = 105$ MeV at the nuclear saturation density. The prediction for f_s depends on values of the dimension 5 condensate and on the Borel mass. However, the OPE constrains that $f_s/f_t \geq 1$, which does not agree with the prediction from the in-medium chiral perturbation theory. Depending on the value of the dimension 5 condensate, f_s at the saturation density is found to be in the range $112 \sim 134$ MeV at the Borel mass $M^2 \sim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Cq; 12.38.Lg; 11.55.Hx; 24.85.+p; 21.65.+f

*Electronic address: hung@phya.yonsei.ac.kr

I. INTRODUCTION

The pion weak decay in nuclear matter is expected to be different from its decay in free space. In hadronic models, the in-medium shift of the decay constant occurs through the scalar meson exchange with background nucleons as well as through isobar-hole (or nucleon-hole) excitations that intermediates a pion and the axial-vector current [1]. The decay constant is directly connected to the renormalization of the induced pseudoscalar coupling, which therefore affects muon captures in nuclei [1, 2, 3, 4].

One peculiar feature of the in-medium decay constant is its separation into the time and space components in the matter [1, 4]. As we will see below, the separation seems to be a natural consequence when a nuclear matrix element of the axial-vector current involving a pion state is considered in defining pion decay constants. The two decay constants are scaled differently with the nuclear density and the induced pseudoscalar constant is separated correspondingly [1]. Interference between the two decay components may be important for explaining the muon capture data in nuclei. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the decay constants in the matter. Indeed, Kirchbach and Wirzba [3] calculated the in-medium decay constants using the in-medium chiral perturbation theory developed in Ref.[5]. It is found that, while the time component is quenched moderately, the space component is quenched somewhat substantially. At the nuclear saturation density, its value is only 20 % of the free decay constant, which seems to be a too much quenching.

Another important motivation for studying the in-medium decay constants is in connection with the so-called Brown-Rho scenario [6]. In this scenario, the in-medium decay constant is a scaling parameter that governs the in-medium reduction of hadron masses in a very simple manner. The quenching of the decay constant can be regarded as a signature of a partial restoration of chiral symmetry. To estimate the degree of the restoration, it is important to calculate the in-medium decay constant model-independently. Such a calculation can be done using QCD sum rules [7, 8].

In this work, we perform QCD sum rule calculation of the in-medium decay constant using the pseudoscalar-axial vector (PA) correlation function in nuclear matter. The in-medium chiral perturbation theory [3] will be used to represent the phenomenological side of the correlation function. In this approach, the low-lying intermediate state involves an in-medium quasi-pion whose pole is well separated from higher resonance poles. As we will see,

the sum rules constructed from this correlator satisfy in some limits the constraints coming purely from PCAC. Therefore, this correlation function may be relevant for studying pion properties in the matter.

In the QCD side, we will use the finite density QCD sum rule techniques developed in Ref. [9, 10, 11]. The finite density QCD sum rule has been used for investigating the self-energies of the nucleon embedded in the matter [9, 10, 11]. Similar sum rule has been applied to the calculation of vector meson masses at finite density [12] or temperature [13]. It can provide a useful constraint for various effective model predictions [14]. A crucial element in the construction of these sum rules is the linear density approximation, which allows to write nuclear matrix elements in terms of nucleon matrix elements plus their vacuum expectation values. In-medium sum rules therefore are valid as long as the density is low. Following these in-medium frameworks, we construct sum rules for the PA correlation function.

This paper is organized as follow. In Section II, we discuss a subtlety in the definition of the in-medium decay constants. The isospin symmetry must be assumed in the usual separation of the time and space components of the decay constant. In Section III, we construct the phenomenological side of the PA correlator by following the in-medium chiral perturbation theory. We then present a few constraints that have to be satisfied in some limits in Section IV. The OPE calculation is given in Section V and the sum rule analysis for the decay constants is presented in Section VI.

II. SEPARATION INTO TWO IN-MEDIUM DECAY CONSTANTS

There is a subtlety in the definition of the pion decay constants in nuclear matter. In this section, we address this issue by defining the in-medium pion decay constant in close analogies with the one in vacuum. To do this, we first recall that in vacuum, the pion decay constant f_π is defined by the relation [15],

$$\langle 0 | \bar{d} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 u | \pi^+(k) \rangle = i f_\pi k^\mu, \quad (f_\pi = 131 \text{ MeV}). \quad (1)$$

A straightforward generalization to the nuclear matter case is to write the following nuclear matrix element into the form [1, 3]

$$\langle \rho | \bar{d} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 u | \pi^+(k) \rho \rangle = (i f_t k_0, i f_s \mathbf{k}), \quad (2)$$

where $|\rho\rangle$ denotes the ground state of the nuclear matter. This is a usual definition that can be found in literature but one can show that taking this definition for the in-medium pion decay constants is equivalent to assuming an exact isospin symmetry in the isospin symmetric matter. The appearance of the two decay constants, f_t and f_s , is also related to the isospin symmetry.

To illustrate this point in detail, we notice that the nuclear matrix element can contain a term proportional to the four-velocity vector u_μ (with $u^2 = 1$) of the nuclear matter as well as a term proportional to the pion momentum k_μ . The part proportional to u_μ can be further separated into two parts, one that vanishes in the soft-pion limit and the other that does not. Hence, we may write the nuclear matrix element into the form,

$$\langle\rho|\bar{d}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5u|\pi^+(k)\rho\rangle = iak^\mu + ibu^\mu(u\cdot k) + icu^\mu, \quad (3)$$

with some in-medium (dimensionful) constants a , b and c . The third term that does not vanish in the soft-pion limit is proportional to the isospin breaking in the medium. This can be easily demonstrated by applying the soft-pion theorem directly to the nuclear matrix element,

$$\langle\rho|\bar{d}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5u|\pi^+(k)\rho\rangle|_{k_\mu\rightarrow 0} \sim \langle\rho|\bar{d}\gamma^\mu d - \bar{u}\gamma^\mu u|\rho\rangle \sim cu^\mu. \quad (4)$$

Thus, c in Eq. (3) is proportional to the isospin breaking in the medium and it is zero either when the isospin symmetry is exact or when the nuclear density is zero. Also under the isospin symmetry, there are only two in-medium constants involved for the matrix element Eq. (3). In the nuclear rest frame $u^\mu = (1, \mathbf{0})$, we recover Eq.(2) with the identifications ¹

$$a + b = f_t; \quad a = f_s. \quad (5)$$

When the isospin symmetry is broken in the matter, one may quickly notice that the time component f_t is not well defined. In this case, the time component of Eq. (3) is $iak^0 + ibk^0 + ic$ and it is not clear how to deal with the c term in defining f_t . Thus, f_t defined in Eq. (2) is only for the isospin symmetric case. The ambiguity in the isospin breaking case is intrinsic

¹ One can expect that a and b in Eq. (3) also contain isospin breaking parts. As the isospin symmetry is assumed throughout this work, we will neglect such terms as well as the terms belonging to c . Thus, a and b in this equation are slightly different from the ones that appear in Eq. (3) by small isospin breaking parts.

in the matter and it may be important when the isospin breaking of the in-medium decays is studied. Somewhat larger breaking can be expected from the kaon channel as the strange vector current is involved. This breaking in fact makes K^+ and K^- decays different. In future, it will be interesting to study how the breaking effect is accommodated systematically in meson decays in the matter. In this work, we will neglect the isospin breaking and focus on the part that can be represented by Eq.(2). The isospin breaking terms in the pion sum rules however are suppressed by the small quark masses and the density.

III. PSEUDOSCALAR AND AXIAL VECTOR CORRELATION FUNCTION

In our QCD sum rule study of the in-medium pion decay constants, we consider the pseudoscalar-axial vector (PA) correlation function in the nuclear medium,

$$\Pi^\mu \equiv i \int d^4x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle \rho | T [\bar{d}(x) i \gamma_5 u(x) \bar{u}(0) \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 d(0)] | \rho \rangle , \quad (6)$$

where $|\rho\rangle$ denotes the ground state of the nuclear matter. Because of the separation in Eq. (2), there are two independent components for this in-medium correlator, time and space components. We will consider the following limit of the two components

$$\lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^0}{ip_0} ; \quad \lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^j}{ip^j} \quad (7)$$

so that the resulting functions in the nuclear rest frame depend on one scalar variable p_0^2 . In this limit, the OPE calculation can be performed at $p_0^2 \rightarrow -large$ unambiguously, which is then straightforwardly matched with the hadronic representation that will be constructed in this section. We will follow Ref. [3] in making a phenomenological ansatz of this correlation function.

Following the in-medium PCAC [4], the pseudoscalar current couples to an in-medium quasi-pion. Hence, the low-lying state that intermediates the PA correlator is expected to be $|\pi(k)\rho\rangle$. Of course, other states containing π' and π'' can also intermediate the correlator but we will treat them as the continuum. Introducing a coupling strength of the pseudoscalar current to the in-medium quasi-pion $\langle \rho | \bar{d} i \gamma_5 u | \rho \pi \rangle \equiv G_\pi^*$ and using Eqs. (3) (with $c = 0$), we obtain the phenomenological side of the PA correlator [3],

$$\Pi^\mu = -i G_\pi^* \frac{ap^\mu + bu^\mu(u \cdot p)}{p^2 - m_\pi^{*2}} . \quad (8)$$

Here we have introduced the in-medium pion mass m_π^* . As we will take the limits given in Eq. (7), a possible $\mathbf{p}$ dependence in m_π^* does not affect our sum rule. PCAC tells us that in vacuum, $G_\pi^* \rightarrow G_\pi = f_\pi m_\pi^2 / 2m_q$. In the matter, we should have $G_\pi^* = f_t m_\pi^{*2} / 2m_q$ so that it satisfies a set of relations given in Ref. [3]. Putting Eq. (5) into Eq. (8) and evaluating it in the nuclear rest frame $u^\mu = (1, \mathbf{0})$, we obtain the phenomenological ansatz for the time and space components of the correlator Π^0 and Π^j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) in terms of f_t and f_s [defined in Eq. (2)],

$$\Pi_{phen}^t \equiv \lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^0}{ip_0} = -\frac{m_\pi^{*2}}{2m_q} \frac{f_t^2}{p_0^2 - m_\pi^{*2}} ; \quad \Pi_{phen}^s \equiv \lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^j}{ip^j} = -\frac{m_\pi^{*2}}{2m_q} \frac{f_t f_s}{p_0^2 - m_\pi^{*2}} . \quad (9)$$

IV. CONSTRAINTS

In order to make a reliable prediction for the decay constants from the PA correlation function, we need to make sure that the intermediate state is dominated by the in-medium quasi-pion state. This quasi-pion dominance should be checked before one makes some claims on the in-medium properties from this PA correlation function. Here, we present two stringent constraints that have to be satisfied for the decay constants. These constraints will be compared with our sum rules later in order to justify our approach.

One constraint is the well-known Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner (GOR) relation

$$-4m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_0 = m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2 , \quad (10)$$

where the subscript denotes the vacuum expectation value. This has to be satisfied in the $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$ order whenever we take the limit $\rho \rightarrow 0$. When $\rho = 0$, we have $f_t = f_s = f_\pi$ and the decay constant is defined by Eq. (1). By taking the divergence of the axial-vector current and using the free equation of motion, we obtain

$$2m_q \langle 0 | \bar{d}i\gamma_5 u | \pi^+(k) \rangle = f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 . \quad (11)$$

Corrections to this will be of the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q^2)$ or higher. The GOR relation Eq.(10) can be easily obtained from this by applying the soft-pion theorem ($k_\mu \rightarrow 0$).

The other constraint is the in-medium GOR relation which will constrain f_t . Starting from the defining equation Eq. (2), we take the divergence of the axial-vector current again assuming that the quasi-pion is on its mass-shell with $k^2 = m_\pi^{*2}$. It gives

$$2m_q \langle \rho | \bar{d}i\gamma_5 u | \pi^+(k) \rho \rangle = f_t m_\pi^{*2} - (f_s - f_t) \mathbf{k}^2 . \quad (12)$$

By taking k slightly off the mass shell, using the reduction formula to convert the pion state into a field, and following the similar steps as in deriving the soft-pion theorem [16], we obtain

$$-\frac{2m_q i}{f_t} \langle \rho | [\bar{d} i \gamma_5 u, Q_5^+] | \rho \rangle = f_t m_\pi^{*2}, \quad (13)$$

where Q_5^+ is the axial charge corresponding to the charged pion. Note, the soft-pion limit has eliminated the dependence on f_s . Using the anticommutation relation for quarks, we easily evaluate the commutator to obtain the in-medium GOR relation

$$-4m_q \langle \bar{q} q \rangle_\rho = m_\pi^{*2} f_t^2. \quad (14)$$

Again, this is an exact relation at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$. The same relation has been obtained from in-medium chiral perturbation theory [3, 5, 17]. Note that in deriving these two constraints Eqs.(10) (14), we need to have a pion (or quasi-pion) state in the matrix elements. It means, the quasi-pion dominance in the PA correlation function can be justified once the resulting sum rules satisfy these constraints.

V. THE OPERATOR PRODUCT EXPANSION (OPE)

The OPE calculation for the pseudoscalar-axial vector (PA) correlation function Eq. (6) is performed in this section. For a simplicity, we will ignore possible contributions from instantons [18] in this PA correlation function. For technical details, we mostly follow Refs. [10, 19]. Before we proceed to the in-medium OPE calculation, it may worth mentioning on how the OPE looks like in the twist expansion. The leading term in the expansion, the scalar part, must take the same form as the vacuum sum rule. In the vacuum case, we know that the correlation function must reproduce the GOR relation at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$. Note, the phenomenological side Eq. (9) contains quark mass in the denominator. To reproduce the GOR relation, only OPE term that does not vanish in the limit $m_q \rightarrow 0$ must be the quark condensate. All others in the OPE must be zero in the limit $m_q \rightarrow 0$ because the GOR relation is an exact relation at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$. Modification to this picture in the medium is driven by the higher twist operators, which do not need to be scaled with quark mass but they must be proportional to the nuclear density.

Another thing to mention is that the isospin symmetry in the medium is assumed in this work. It means that π^+ or π^- decays are assumed to be the same. Note, once the

isospin breaking is introduced, the time component f_t is not well-defined. Anyway, under the isospin symmetry, the OPE must be symmetric under $u \leftrightarrow d$ as it should be.

The OPE of the correlator Eq.(6) can be calculated by using the standard techniques in the fixed-point gauge [20]. To include the finite quark mass effectively, we express the correlator in the momentum space. Introducing an in-medium quark propagator $S_j(k)$ ($j = u, d$) in the momentum space, we write Eq. (6) as

$$\Pi^\mu = -i \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr} [iS_d(k) i\gamma_5 iS_u(k-p) \gamma^\mu \gamma_5] . \quad (15)$$

The trace is taken over the Dirac and color indices. The perturbative part can be calculated by using the free propagator

$$iS_j^{free}(k) = i \frac{\not{k} + m_j}{k^2 - m_j^2} \quad (j = u, d) \quad (16)$$

in Eq. (15). Using standard techniques of the dimensional regularization and the Feynman parameterization, we readily compute the perturbative part,

$$\Pi_{pert}^\mu(p^2) = -\frac{3}{4\pi^2} i p^\mu \int_0^1 du \, m_q \ln[-u(1-u)p^2 + m_q^2] \quad (17)$$

with $m_q = (m_d + m_u)/2$.

Nonperturbative contributions involving the quark condensate can be obtained by replacing one propagator by the disconnected nonlocal quark condensate, $iS_{ab}^{\alpha\beta}(k) \rightarrow \int d^4 x \, e^{ik \cdot x} \langle q_a^\alpha(x) \bar{q}_b^\beta(0) \rangle_\rho$ while the other propagator remains to be the free quark propagator. The subscript ρ indicates the in-medium expectation value. A Taylor expansion around $x_\mu = 0$ leads to [10, 21],

$$\int d^4 x \, e^{ik \cdot x} \langle q_a^\alpha(x) \bar{q}_b^\beta(0) \rangle_\rho = -\frac{\delta_{ab}}{12} (2\pi)^4 \left\{ \delta^{\alpha\beta} A(k) + \gamma_\lambda^{\alpha\beta} B^\lambda(k) \right\} \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A(k) &= \langle \bar{q} q \rangle_\rho \delta^{(4)}(k) + \langle \bar{q} D_\mu q \rangle_\rho \frac{\partial}{i \partial k^\mu} \delta^{(4)}(k) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{q} D_\mu D_\nu q \rangle_\rho \frac{\partial}{i \partial k^\mu} \frac{\partial}{i \partial k^\nu} \delta^{(4)}(k) + \dots, \\ B^\lambda(k) &= \langle \bar{q} \gamma^\lambda q \rangle_\rho \delta^{(4)}(k) + \langle \bar{q} \gamma^\lambda D_\mu q \rangle_\rho \frac{\partial}{i \partial p^\mu} \delta^{(4)}(k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{q} \gamma^\lambda D_\mu D_\nu q \rangle_\rho \frac{\partial}{i \partial k^\mu} \frac{\partial}{i \partial k^\nu} \delta^{(4)}(k) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

A few technical remarks are in order. Note that the dimension of the correlator is even. In the phenomenological side Eq. (8), one dimension is taken up by p^μ so the rest has an odd

dimension. It means, the constants a and b in Eq. (8) pick up nonzero contributions only from odd dimensional operators in the OPE. Even dimensional operators are not symmetric under $u \leftrightarrow d$ and constitute the isospin breaking parts of the OPE which we ignore in this work. Then, this observation yields interesting consequences. When the part $A(k)$ in Eq. (18) is taken for the disconnected quark propagator, then only the $\not{k}$ part of the free quark propagator Eq. (16) survives through the trace in Eq. (15). In this case, the term like $\langle \bar{q} D_\mu q \rangle_\rho$ constitutes even dimensional contributions, thus cannot contribute to our isospin symmetric decomposition of Eq. (8). Similarly when the part B^λ in Eq.(18) is taken for the disconnected quark propagator, then the m_j part of the free quark propagator gives nonzero contributions. Odd dimensional operators in B^λ (for example $\langle \bar{q} \gamma^\lambda q \rangle_\rho$) combine with m_j to form even dimensional operators and they can not contribute to Eq. (8). In-medium condensates that contribute to our sum rules can be decomposed into [10]

$$\langle \bar{q} D_\mu D_\nu q \rangle_\rho = \frac{4}{3} \langle \bar{q} (u \cdot D)^2 q \rangle_\rho \left[u_\mu u_\nu - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \langle \bar{q} D^2 q \rangle_\rho (u_\mu u_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}) , \quad (20)$$

$$\langle \bar{q} \gamma_\mu D_\nu q \rangle_\rho = \frac{4}{3} \langle \bar{q} \not{u} \cdot D q \rangle_\rho \left[u_\mu u_\nu - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \langle \bar{q} \not{u} q \rangle_\rho (u_\mu u_\nu - g_{\mu\nu}) . \quad (21)$$

Another nonperturbative contributions come from the quark-gluon mixing operator. To form such an operator, we need to take the quark propagator with one gluon line attached [8]

$$iS_{cd}(k) \rightarrow \frac{g_s}{2} G_{\alpha\beta}^A t_{cd}^A \frac{1}{(k^2 - m_q^2)^3} (\not{k} + m_q) \gamma^\beta (\not{k} + m_q) \gamma^\alpha (\not{k} + m_q) , \quad (22)$$

where $G_{\alpha\beta}^A$ is the gluon field tensor, t_A the SU(3) generators in color space with the normalization $Tr(t^A t^B) = \delta^{AB}/2$, c and d color indices. Taking the gluon tensor and moving it into the disconnected quark propagator, one can form a quark-gluon mixed condensate in the medium [10]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_s q_c^\alpha \bar{q}_d^\beta G_{\mu\nu}^A \rangle_\rho &= -\frac{t_{cd}^A}{96} \left\{ \langle \bar{q} g_s \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_\rho [\sigma_{\mu\nu} + i(u_\mu \gamma_\nu - u_\nu \gamma_\mu) \not{u}]^{\alpha\beta} \right. \\ &\quad + \langle g_s \bar{q} \not{u} \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_\rho [\sigma_{\mu\nu} \not{u} + i(u_\mu \gamma_\nu - u_\nu \gamma_\mu)]^{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad \left. - 4 [\langle \bar{q} (u \cdot D)^2 q \rangle + i m_q \langle \bar{q} \not{u} \cdot D q \rangle] [\sigma_{\mu\nu} + 2i(u_\mu \gamma_\nu - u_\nu \gamma_\mu) \not{u}]^{\alpha\beta} \right\} . \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

Here note, $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu} \equiv G_{\mu\nu}^A t^A$.

Combining all these ingredients, we readily compute nonperturbative parts that can contribute up to dimension 5. After a lengthy but straightforward calculation, we obtain

$$\Pi_{nonpert}^\mu = i p^\mu \frac{2 \langle \bar{q} q \rangle_\rho}{p^2 - m_q^2} + \frac{4}{3} m_q \langle \bar{q} \not{u} \cdot D q \rangle_\rho \frac{p^\mu - 4 p \cdot u u^\mu}{(p^2 - m_q^2)^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{2i}{3}m_q^2\langle\bar{q}q\rangle_\rho\left[\frac{p^\mu-2p\cdot uu^\mu}{(p^2-m_q^2)^2}+\frac{4(p\cdot u)^2p^\mu}{(p^2-m_q^2)^3}\right] \\
& +\left[\frac{32i}{3}\langle\bar{q}(u\cdot D)^2q\rangle_\rho-\frac{4i}{3}\langle\bar{q}g_s\sigma\cdot\mathcal{G}q\rangle_\rho\right]\left[\frac{p\cdot uu^\mu}{(p^2-m_q^2)^2}-\frac{(p\cdot u)^2p^\mu}{(p^2-m_q^2)^3}\right] \\
& -\frac{16}{3}m_q\langle\bar{q}\not{u}\cdot Dq\rangle_\rho\frac{p\cdot uu^\mu-p^\mu/4}{(p^2-m_q^2)^2}+\frac{4}{3}m_q\langle\bar{q}\not{D}q\rangle_\rho\frac{p\cdot uu^\mu-p^\mu}{(p^2-m_q^2)^2}. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have not written down even dimensional operators belonging to the isospin breaking.

At the dimension 5, one can expect another nonperturbative contributions (with odd dimensional condensate) containing $m_q\langle\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\mathcal{G}^2\rangle_\rho$ (or gluonic twist operators times m_q). To compute this, we use quark propagators with one and two gluon attached [8] in the calculation of Eq. (15). Somewhat lengthy calculations show that the Wilson coefficient of this term is infrared divergent when the quark mass goes to zero. In the case of the vacuum sum rule, Ref. [22] proposed a simple prescription to extract the gluonic Wilson coefficient. In our in-medium sum rule, further complications arise due to gluonic twist operators and the simple prescription proposed in Ref. [22] needs to be further developed for the twist operators. However, all these gluonic contributions must contain the quark mass (to make dimension 5 condensate) and they should be small. They may however be important in the kaon channel as the strange quark mass is much larger than m_u or m_d , which will be studied in future.

Since we are constructing sum rules for the two scalar functions given in Eq. (9), we can write down from Eqs.(17) (24) the time and space components of $\Pi^\mu = \Pi_{pert}^\mu + \Pi_{nonpert}^\mu$ in the nuclear rest frame $u^\mu = (1, \mathbf{0})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{ope}^t & \equiv \lim_{\mathbf{p}\rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^0}{ip_0} \\
& = -\frac{3}{4\pi^2} \int_0^1 du \, m_q \ln[-u(1-u)p_0^2 + m_q^2] + \frac{2\langle\bar{q}q\rangle_\rho}{p_0^2 - m_q^2} + \frac{8m_q\langle q^\dagger iD_0q\rangle_\rho - 2m_q^2\langle\bar{q}q\rangle_\rho}{(p_0^2 - m_q^2)^2} \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{ope}^s & \equiv \lim_{\mathbf{p}\rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pi^j}{ip^j} \\
& = -\frac{3}{4\pi^2} \int_0^1 du \, m_q \ln[-u(1-u)p_0^2 + m_q^2] + \frac{2\langle\bar{q}q\rangle_\rho}{p_0^2 - m_q^2} - \frac{8}{3} \frac{m_q\langle q^\dagger iD_0q\rangle_\rho}{(p_0^2 - m_q^2)^2} - \frac{2m_q^2\langle\bar{q}q\rangle_\rho}{(p_0^2 - m_q^2)^2} \\
& \quad + \frac{32}{3} \left[\langle\bar{q}iD_0iD_0q\rangle_\rho + \frac{1}{8}\langle\bar{q}g_s\sigma\cdot\mathcal{G}q\rangle_\rho \right] \frac{1}{(p_0^2 - m_q^2)^2}. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

In obtaining this, we have neglected the terms whose dimension in the numerator is 7.

VI. THE IN-MEDIUM PION DECAY CONSTANTS

Having calculated the OPE for the PA correlation function, we can easily construct QCD sum rules for the in-medium pion decay constants f_t and f_s . Taking imaginary part of Eqs. (9), (25), (26) and matching them within the duality region with a Borel weight e^{-s/M^2} ,

$$\int_0^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}[\Pi_{phen}^l(s) - \Pi_{ope}^l(s)] = 0 \quad (l = t, s), \quad (27)$$

we obtain sum rules for the time and space components separately,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_\pi^{*2}}{2m_q} f_t^2 e^{-m_\pi^{*2}/M^2} &= \frac{3m_q}{4\pi^2} \int_{4m_q^2}^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_q^2}{s}} - 2\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &+ \frac{8m_q}{M^2} \langle q^\dagger i D_0 q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} - \frac{2m_q^2}{M^2} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_\pi^{*2}}{2m_q} f_t f_s e^{-m_\pi^{*2}/M^2} &= \frac{3m_q}{4\pi^2} \int_{4m_q^2}^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_q^2}{s}} - 2\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &- \frac{8m_q}{3M^2} \langle q^\dagger i D_0 q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} - \frac{2m_q^2}{M^2} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &+ \frac{32}{3M^2} \left[\langle \bar{q} i D_0 i D_0 q \rangle_\rho + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q} g_s \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_\rho \right] e^{-m_q^2/M^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The continuum threshold is denoted by S_0 . The dependence on this parameter is expected to be small as the perturbative part is proportional to the quark mass.

Various nuclear matrix elements appearing in the OPE can be written in terms of corresponding nucleon matrix elements (denoted by the subscript “ N ” below) in the linear density approximation. In this approximation, the dimension 4 and 5 condensates can be written [10]

$$\langle q^\dagger i D_0 q \rangle_\rho = \rho \langle q^\dagger i D_0 q \rangle_N + \frac{m_q}{4} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho, \quad (30)$$

$$\langle \bar{q} i D_0 i D_0 q \rangle_\rho + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q} g_s \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_\rho = \rho \left[\langle \bar{q} i D_0 i D_0 q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q} g_s \sigma \cdot \mathcal{G} q \rangle_N \right] + \frac{m_q^2}{4} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho. \quad (31)$$

These expressions are slightly different from the ones in Ref. [10] by the quark-mass dependent terms but whose appearance can be easily understood from the equation of motion. Ref. [10] neglected these small quark mass terms. It is interesting to see that, with these quark mass terms, the Wilson coefficient of the condensate $m_q^2 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho$ is delicately canceled away. Anyway, in this separation, the nucleon matrix elements should be understood as the ones in the chiral limit $m_q \rightarrow 0$. According to Ref. [10]

$$\langle q^\dagger i D_0 q \rangle_N \sim 0.18 \text{ GeV}, \quad (32)$$

$$\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8}\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N \sim 0.08 - 0.3 \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (33)$$

The value of the first equation comes from the twist-2 quark distribution function in a nucleon. The value of the second line, the dimension 5 term, is not well-known. This is related to the twist-3 nucleon distribution function whose value however can not be reliably calculated. The bag model estimate gives 0.08 GeV^2 [10] while the other standard estimate yields 0.3 GeV^2 [10]. In our later analysis, we will take these two values as a window of this dimension 5 condensate.

But it is important to note that this dimension 5 term can not be negative. To prove this statement, first note that $\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N = 2\langle \bar{q}D^2q \rangle_N$. Using further that $D^2 = D_0^2 - \mathbf{D}^2$, one can rewrite

$$\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8}\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N = \frac{3}{4}\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{4}\langle \bar{q}(i\mathbf{D})^2q \rangle_N. \quad (34)$$

Note, iD_0 and $i\mathbf{D}$ are hermitian operators and therefore their square must be positive definite. This means that this dimension 5 condensate, as it contains the positive definite operators, must have the same sign as the positive quantity $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_N$.

Using Eqs.(30), (31), we rewrite Eqs.(28), (29) as (transferring the quark mass from the LHS to the RHS)

$$\begin{aligned} m_\pi^{*2} f_t^2 e^{-m_\pi^{*2}/M^2} &= \frac{3m_q^2}{2\pi^2} \int_{4m_q^2}^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_q^2}{s}} - 4m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &+ \frac{16m_q^2}{M^2} \rho \langle q^\dagger iD_0q \rangle_N e^{-m_q^2/M^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_\pi^{*2} f_t f_s e^{-m_\pi^{*2}/M^2} &= \frac{3m_q^2}{2\pi^2} \int_{4m_q^2}^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_q^2}{s}} - 4m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &- \frac{16m_q^2}{3M^2} \rho \langle q^\dagger iD_0q \rangle_N e^{-m_q^2/M^2} \\ &+ \frac{64m_q}{3M^2} \rho \left[\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8}\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N \right] e^{-m_q^2/M^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Our two sum rules mainly differ by the dimension 5 condensate $\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8}\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N$. Other terms that make the two sum rules different are suppressed by higher orders in small quark mass.

As we have announced, let us see if these sum rules satisfy the constraints discussed in Sec. II. First in the limit, $\rho \rightarrow 0$, we have $f_t = f_s = f_\pi$, $m_\pi^* = m_\pi$. Then, one can easily

see that the two sum rules become identical to the vacuum pion sum rule that appears in Ref. [19],

$$f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 e^{-m_\pi^2/M^2} = \frac{3m_q^2}{2\pi^2} \int_{4m_q^2}^{S_0} ds e^{-s/M^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_q^2}{s}} - 4m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle e^{-m_q^2/M^2} . \quad (37)$$

This give a mathematical check for our OPE expression. Furthermore, at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$, one can see that the GOR relation is precisely satisfied (Note, the perturbative part is an order $\mathcal{O}(m_q^2)$).

The additional check can be made by observing that the f_t sum rule satisfies the in-medium GOR relation. Namely, in the sum rule for f_t Eq. (35), dominant piece of the OPE comes from $m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho$. The other OPE are down by higher orders in quark mass. That is, at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$ [or at the order in $\mathcal{O}(m_\pi^{*2})$], this sum rule precisely reproduces the in-medium GOR relation [See also Ref. [3, 5, 17].],

$$m_\pi^{*2} f_t^2 \simeq -4m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho . \quad (38)$$

Such a simple relation can not be obtained from the space component sum rule Eq.(36) due to the non-negligible dimension 5 term $\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N$. Based on these two checks, the quasi-pion dominance in the PA correlation function can be justified because the two constraints require a quasi-pion in the intermediate state.

The ratio of Eqs.(35) (36) gives us an interesting relation for f_t and f_s . Namely neglecting the terms of order $\mathcal{O}(m_q^2)$ and higher, we find the approximate formula,

$$\frac{f_s}{f_t} \simeq 1 - \frac{16\rho}{3M^2} \frac{\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8} \langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N}{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho} . \quad (39)$$

When $\rho \rightarrow 0$, the ratio becomes the unity as it should be. Note, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho$ is negative and the dimension 5 condensate in the numerator is, as we have emphasized, *positive*. Therefore, we should have

$$f_s \geq f_t . \quad (40)$$

One may suspect that the OPE does not converge fast enough up to dimension 5 and large contributions from higher dimensional operators can alter this inequality. But non-negligible higher dimensional operators (even if they exist) must be related to twist operators that scale with the density. The scalar (nontwist) operators with higher dimensions must

be proportional to $\mathcal{O}(m_q^2)$ or higher orders because the scalar part of the sum rule at the order $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$ must satisfy the GOR relation. Higher twist operators are suppressed either in the twist expansion and by the high correlator momentum. For operators having the same twist but with higher spin indices, we do not have a systematic way to analyze them but their contributions are usually smaller than the contribution from lower spin operators [12, 13] in in-medium sum rules. Even if there are large corrections from higher dimensional operators (though it is unlikely), the Borel window from which the physical parameter is to be extracted will be chosen such a way that their contributions are small. In this window, their contributions will be down by higher orders of the Borel mass (M^4 , M^6 and so on) and their effects affect only the region around the lower boundary of the window. Therefore, it is unlikely that such higher dimensional terms reverse the inequality.

On the other hand, the in-medium chiral perturbation theory gives the ratio in terms of the chiral perturbation parameters (Note, $f_\pi = 131$ MeV in our notation.) [3],

$$\frac{f_s}{f_t} = \frac{1 + \frac{4c_3\rho}{f_\pi^2}}{1 + \frac{4(c_2+c_3)\rho}{f_\pi^2}} = 1 - \frac{\frac{4c_2\rho}{f_\pi^2}}{1 + \frac{4(c_2+c_3)\rho}{f_\pi^2}}. \quad (41)$$

With the parameter values, $c_2 = 0.28$ fm and $c_3 = -0.55$ fm given in Ref. [3], the ratio is 0.28 at the nuclear saturation density $\rho = 0.17$ fm $^{-3}$, substantially smaller than the unity. If one compares with the free decay constant, the value seems to be suppressed too much, only 20 % of f_π . Even if we take into account an error in f_s coming from a large uncertainty in the parameter c_3 [3], our finding is still inconsistent with this result. To be comparable with this result, the higher dimensional terms that we have not calculated need to be an order of the leading term in the OPE, which certainly is not realistic.

We now include the higher order m_q corrections in our analysis and calculate the decay constants at the nuclear saturation density. In the phenomenological side, we have three parameters to be determined f_t , f_s and m_π^* but we have only two sum rules. The best fitting method with a trial function of the form ae^{-b/M^2} may not reliably determine the exponent b . Further input may be needed. For simplicity, we take the in-medium pion mass to be its free value $m_\pi^* = m_\pi$. This assumption is supported by Ref. [3, 23, 24] where the mass change in the medium is calculated to be about 10 MeV. It should be noted that this assumption does not affect one of our results Eq. (40) as the pion mass is canceled in the ratio.

The in-medium quark condensate in the linear density approximation is given by [10, 25]

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_\rho = \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_0 + \rho \frac{\sigma_N}{2m_q} . \quad (42)$$

The vacuum expectation value is denoted by the subscript “0”. In our analysis, we will use $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_0 = -(225 \text{ MeV})^3$ that corresponds to the quark mass $m_q \sim 7 \text{ MeV}$ [26, 27]. The nucleon sigma term is $\sigma_N \sim 45 \text{ MeV}$ [28]. The values for the other nucleon matrix elements are given in Eq.(33). The continuum threshold S_0 will be fixed to the π' mass but the sensitivity of our result on this choice is very small.

In Figure 1, the solid lines show the time component of the decay constant f_t with respect to the Borel mass. The upper one is the vacuum case and the lower one is from Eq. (35) at the nuclear saturation density $\rho = 0.17 \text{ fm}^{-3}$. The dashed lines are obtained from the GOR relation. f_t from the OPE is only 2 % larger than the one from the GOR relation. It is clear from this figure that there is no dependence on the Borel mass. At the saturation density, we obtain

$$f_t = 105 \text{ MeV} , \quad (43)$$

20 % lower than its free space value. It is not so different from the value of the in-medium chiral perturbation theory $f_t = 101 \text{ MeV}$ [3].

Figure 2 shows the Borel curve for the ratio f_s/f_t . The solid curves are from Eqs.(35) (36) and the dashed curves are from our approximate formula Eq.(39), which are almost indistinguishable from the full curves. Therefore, higher m_q corrections are negligible. In getting the upper two curves, we use the dimension 5 condensate $\langle \bar{q}iD_0iD_0q \rangle_N + \frac{1}{8}\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma \cdot \mathcal{G}q \rangle_N = 0.3 \text{ GeV}^2$ while the lower two curves use 0.08 GeV^2 . The Borel curves are not so stable with respect to the Borel mass. Therefore, they are not so useful in extracting the precise value of the ratio. Higher dimensional operators that we have not included in our calculation may affect the Borel curves at lower mass region and stabilize the curves. Their contributions however should become smaller as we go to higher Borel masses. Anyway, because of this Borel instability, we are not able to predict a precise value for the ratio. As a rough estimate, at $M^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, we find the ratio $f_s/f_t = 1.28$ from the upper curve and 1.07 from the lower curve. The variation within $0.8 \text{ GeV}^2 \leq M^2 \leq 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ is estimated only 3 % - 10 %. Using our result of $f_t = 105 \text{ MeV}$, the two extremes give the range

$$112 \text{ MeV} \leq f_s \leq 134 \text{ MeV} . \quad (44)$$

Thus, in this rough estimate, the space component of the pion decay constant either slightly increases or decreases from its vacuum value depending upon the value of the dimension 5 condensate. Of course a more detailed analysis after including higher dimensional operators may be need to determine the precise value of f_s .

VII. SUMMARY

In this work, we have constructed QCD sum rules for the pion decay constant in nuclear matter. The pseudoscalar-axial vector correlation function in the matter has been used for this purpose. The sum rule for f_t is found to satisfy the in-medium GOR relation, which indicates that the method we used is reasonable for investigating the pion properties in the matter. The OPE for the space component contains the non-negligible dimension 5 contribution in addition to the quark condensate. We have established a firm constraint $f_s \geq f_t$ and it does not agree with the result from the in-medium chiral perturbation theory. Neglecting the in-medium shift of the pion mass, we have obtained $f_t = 105$ MeV. Using this value and from a rough estimate, the space component of the decay constant is found to be in the range $112 \text{ MeV} \leq f_s \leq 134 \text{ MeV}$.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant KRF-2001-015-DP0104. We thank Mannque Rho and Su Houn Lee for useful discussions.

-
- [1] M. Kirchbach and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. **A 578** (1994) 511.
 - [2] E. Kh. Akhmedov, Nucl. Phys. **A 500** (1989) 596.
 - [3] M. Kirchbach and A. Wirzba, Nucl. Phys. **A 616** (1997) 648.
 - [4] E. Kh. Akhmedov, Y. V. Gaponov and I. N. Mishustin, Phys. Lett. **B 92** (1980) 261.
 - [5] V. Thorsson and A. Wirzba, Nucl. Phys. **A 589** (1995) 633.
 - [6] G. E. Brown and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 2720.
 - [7] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B 147** (1979) 385.; M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B 147** (1979) 448.

- [8] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki, Phys. Rep. **127** (1985) 1.
- [9] R. J. Furnstahl, D. K. Griegel and T.D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. **C 46** (1992) 1507.
- [10] X. Jin, T.D. Cohen, R. J. Furnstahl and D. K. Griegel, Phys. Rev. **C 47** (1993) 2882.
- [11] X. Jin, M. Nielsen, T.D. Cohen, R. J. Furnstahl and D. K. Griegel, Phys. Rev. **C 49** (1994) 464.
- [12] T. Hatsuda and S. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. **C 46** (1992) R34.
- [13] T. Hatsuda, Y. Koike and S. H. Lee, Nucl. Phys. **B 394** (1993) 221.
- [14] B. Friman, S. H. Lee and Hungchong Kim, Nucl. Phys. **A 653** (1999) 91.
- [15] S. L. Adler and R. Dashen, *Current Algebras and Applications to Particle Physics* (Benjamin, New York) (1968).
- [16] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B. R. Holstein, “Dynamics of the standard model,” *Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1992) 540 p. (Cambridge monographs on particle physics, nuclear physics and cosmology, 2)*.
- [17] M. Kirchbach and A. Wirzba, Nucl. Phys. **A 604** (1996) 395.
- [18] E. V. Shuryak, *The QCD vacuum, Hadrons, and the Superdense Matter* (World Scientific, Singapore) (1988).
- [19] H. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 014022 (2001) [hep-ph/0102123].
- [20] V. A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Fortsch. Phys. **32** (1985) 585.
- [21] V. Elias, T. G. Steele and M. D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. **D 38** (1988) 1584.
- [22] E. Bagan, J. I. Latorre and P. Pascual, Z. Phys. C **32**, 43 (1986).
- [23] T. S. Park, H. Jung, D. P. Min, nucl-th/0101064.; N. Kaiser and W. Weise, nucl-th/0102062
- [24] J. Delorme, G. Chanfray and M. Ericson, Nucl. Phys. **A 603** (1996) 239.
- [25] T.D. Cohen, R. J. Furnstahl and D. K. Griegel, Phys. Rev. **C 45** (1992) 1881.
- [26] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Rep. **87** (1982) 77.
- [27] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B 378** (1996) 313.
- [28] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, and M. E. Sainio, Phys. Lett. **B 253** (1991) 252.

FIG. 1: The Borel curves for f_t , the solid lines from its sum rule and the dashed lines from the GOR relation. The upper two curves are the vacuum case and the lower two curves are obtained from the in-medium sum rule at the nuclear saturation density $\rho = 0.17 \text{ fm}^{-3}$.




FIG. 2: The Borel curves for the ratio f_s/f_t at the nuclear saturation density $\rho = 0.17 \text{ fm}^{-3}$. The upper curves are obtained with the dimension 5 condensate 0.3 GeV^2 and the lower curves are obtained with 0.08 GeV^2 . The solid curves are from our sum rules and the almost indistinguishable dashed curves are from the approximate formula Eq. (39).

